DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 768 EA 014 796

AUTHOR Leon, Anibal; And Others
TITLE A Cross-Cultural Study of Teacher Autonomy.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Analysis of Variance; Cluster Analysis; *Cross Cultural Studies; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Organizational Theories; Power Structure; Predictor Variables; *School Organization; Tables (Data); *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Brazil; Jordan; System Coupling; *Teacher Autonomy; Teacher Autonomy Scale; United States; Venezuela

ABSTRACT

Elementary and secondary teachers in Brazil, Jordan, Venezuela, and the United States feel they have a fair amount of autonomy in running their own classrooms, somewhat less autonomy regarding certain miscellaneous job-related matters, and still less autonomy in matters affecting the operation of the school as an organization. The attitudes of a nonrandom sample of between 100 and 200 teachers from each of the countries were assessed using a modified version of the Teacher Autonomy Scale, a 39-item Likert-type questionnaire. The questions simulated job-oriented requests that a principal might make of teachers in areas that could be considered teacher territory, principal territory, and ambiguous territory. The data were analyzed using analysis of variance and cluster analysis techniques. Responses did not correlate significantly across several countries with any demographic variable except teacher sex--in Brazil, Jordan, and Venezuela female teachers felt less autonomous than did males. The study failed to support the hypothesis that societies with pluralistic systems of control would encourage looser coupling in school systems and permit greater teacher autonomy--teachers in the U.S. felt the least autonomy among those studied, perhaps because of the relative power of principals in decentralized school systems. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218768

A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY OF TEACHER AUTONOMY[1]

by

Anibal Leon, David Nason, Khalid Omari,
Berenice Bastos and Arthur Blumberg[2]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Anibal Leon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

[1]Paper prepared for presentation at the Convention of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March, 1982.

[2]Anibal Leon and David Nason are doctoral candidates in the School of Education, Syracuse University. Khalid Omari is on the faculty of Yarmuk University, Jordan. Berenice Bastos is a public school supervisor, Recife, Brazil. Arthur Blumberg is Professor of Education, Syracuse University.

EA 014 796

A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY OF TEACHER AUTONOMY[1]

by

Anibal Leon, David Nason, Khalid Omari, Berenice Bastos, and Arthur Blumberg[2]

Background

Following Katz and Kahn (1978), it is clear that schools in most societies, as organizations, have grown from systems that were primitive to those that must be characterized as complex and large scale (Coombs, 1968), and that now, more than before, they rely on bureaucratic models of management. It might be supposed meanwhile that to administer this expanded system, higher levels of control and coordination are needed to attain the desired level of efficiency. This view seems to fit the general, overall pattern of educational systems, relative to their administration, but not the internal make-up of most single school organizations which have been found to lack internal coordination and control (Meyer-Rowan, 1978).

The literature, here in the United States and elsewhere, on school organizations, presents contradictory points of view. One kind of analysis shows schools as formal organizations gaining higher levels of bureaucratization and professionalization (Sousa and Hoy, 1981; Albornoz, 1977). The former is seen as a consequence of size, complexity, ideology, turbulence, etc., and the latter as a response to competition and adaptation to societal demands. Another type of analysis presents schools as "loosely-coupled systems" (Weick, 1976) in which rudimentary patterns of bureaucracy are found (Bidwell, 1965). This position acknowledges that though rules surround the conditions of work, that a simple division of work exists, and that there is a hierarchical distribution

---

[1]Paper prepared for presentation at the Convention of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March, 1982.

[2]Anibal Leon and David Nason are doctoral candidates in the School of Education, Syracuse University. Khalid Omari is on the faculty of Yarmuk University, Jordan. Berenice Bastos is a public school administrator, Recife, Brazil. Arthur Blumberg is Professor of Education, Syracuse University.

of authority, schools seem to lack the rationality that is usually associated with bureaucratic organizations. According to the principle of rationality, the administrative structure of an organization must be an expression of its goals, from which the technological structure should also follow. The same principle should determine the formal organizational processes that take place in the organization. But according to Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972), Meyer and Rowan (1978) and Weick (1976), processes such as decision making, control, supervision, coordination, etc. are casual and non-rational in nature.

The bureaucratic approach to educational organization portrays teaching as a kind of activity that is performed under organizational restrictions that encourage conflicts (Sergiovanni and Carver, 1980) between teachers and the organization, for they hold different values. So, teachers and administraiors will tend to be apart from each other linked only by the role they perform and not by the values they sustain. In this sense, teachers are simple subordinates under the constant control of far reaching rules and regulations and the close supervision of principals and supervisors.

However, the "loosely-coupled" approach views teaching as an occupation to which a large amount of autonomy is attached. Specifically the work of Bidwell (1965), Lortie (1969, 1977), Meyer and Rowan (1978), Charters (ND) and Blumberg (1980) is reinforcing of this assumption.

Two primary reasons for the existence of this "large amount of autonomy: can be drawn from the studies of Lortie (1969), Dreeben (1973), Bidwell (1965) and Weick (1976). They are: (1) the formal structure of most schools leads teachers to work in isolation in self-contained classrooms; (2) the unrationalized nature of

the teacher technique; (3) the diffuseness of the school organization goals; and, (4) the authority structure of most schools' organizations. Referring to the structure, Bidwell, one of the first to notice this characteristic of school organization and its impact on teachers' autonomy, stated, for example:

> Teacher autonomy is reflected in the structure of school systems, resulting in what might be called their structural looseness. The teacher works alone within the classroom, relatively hidden from colleagues and superiors, so that he has a broad discretionary jurisdiction within the boundaries of the classroom. (p. 976)

The authority structure of an organization is the resulting effect of the interaction of roles (Katz and Kahn, 1978) in which there is clear evidence of the power of a superior over a subordinate. Compliance with authority is basic to what is described as hierarchical control in organizations, in which all superordinate's actions and requests are felt uniformly throughout the lower levels of the organization. That is to say, that most subordinates' actions are marked by the action of a superior, limiting their self-determination and autonomy. This seems not to be the case in most schools which according to Weick (1976) leave broad room for self-determination of the actors, i.e. teachers and principals. In the same direction, Lortie (1969) points out that in schools there are various "zones" in which initiatory power of principals varies according to the problem of each zone. He predicts that "in the case of principal-teacher interaction," in matters related to the school organization and its maintenance, the principal might have more initiatory power than teachers whose power may increase when matters are related to the classroom, the zone of instructional. However, he also recognizes that more research is needed to clarify

this zoning of authority within the school hierarchical system.

Meyer and Rowan (1978), talking about the same characteristics of schools, explain that "instructional activities are coordinated quite casually in most American institutions. But activities or ritual classification are tightly controlled by administrative decisions" (p. 8). This argument is supported by Blumberg (1980) who found three different dimensions that make up the authority structure of most educational organizations, i.e. an organizational dimension controlled by the principal, a classroom dimension controlled by teachers, and a miscellaneous dimension controlled by no one. This typology is similar to that discussed by Kunz and Hoy (1976) who refer to an organizational domain, a personal domain, and a professional domain. Both Blumberg's and Kunz and Hoy's studies suggest that, in general, the principal is in a better position to get teachers' compliance when issues are related to the organization. rather than to the classroom.

The findings of the cited works have implications for research on school organizations. One implication is the initiation of comparative studies which allow us to assess other contexts relative to these questions. In general, it has been said that schools and any other type of organization are affected by the environment in which they work (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967). However, organizations have developed characteristics that are considered to be universal. Tannenbaum (1977), for example, regards the hierarchical control principal as a universal feature of organizations. Hickson et al (1972) found that the relationship between some organizational variables such as size and specialization, and formalization; and between dependence and autonomy is "constant in direction and magnitude irrespective of differences in the contexts between societies."

At first glance, schools, regardless of their societal context, seem to fit the notion of having universal characteristics. They have a structure made out of almost the same elements, i.e. teachers, classrooms, children, principals, parents, etc. Such a system develops a culture. They all have rules and regulations, principles and values. Schools appear to perform the same function which, according to Parsons (1970) and Durkheim (1956), is the socialization of the young generation into adulthood. The way schools perform this main function appears to be very similar all over the world. In most schools, no matter where you go, you find a group of children organized around a teacher.

Nevertheless, schools are different. They are reflective of and sometimes dominated by the society to which they belong. Meyer and Rowan (1978) state, for instance, that "the formal structure of educational organizations tends to come more in correspondence with environmental categories" (p. 104). It could be hypothesized then, that most educational activities, either organizational or instructional, will be more "loosely-coupled" in societies with pluralistic systems of control, like the United States, and more tightly-coupled in countries with centralized systems. Relative to teachers' feelings of autonomy, it will follow, then, that teachers might tend to sense more autonomy in societies with pluralistic systems of control than in societies with centralized systems of control.

As far as we know, there has been only one study that dealt with this problem in a cross-cultural context. It was conducted by Menlo (1978) and focused on a tri-national comparison of teachers' perceptions of autonomy, comparing English, American, and German teachers. The findings showed that English teachers felt more autonomous than American, these more than the Germans.

The present study addresses the cross-cultural questions of teachers' autonomy. The general hypothesis that orients this study is that teachers tend to develop the same patterns of perception of autonomy regardless of the country's educational characteristics. That is, school everywhere will tend to develop almost identical authority structures. One in which teachers control more activities relative to instructional issues and less so relative to organizational activities.

Despite the direction that previous studies, in the United States, tend to set relative to this problem, this research should be considered exploratory in nature. Our purpose is to answer some questions more than to reject or accept any particular point of view.

For the purpose of this research, autonomy is defined as the capacity of the teacher to reject or accept requests that come from the principal.

Procedures

1. The Sample. There are four countries involved in this study: the United States, Brazil, Jordan, and Venezuela. They are assumed to be culturally different, thus appropriate settings for cross-cultural comparison. They also differ regarding their school organizational structure. The American educational system is an example of decentralization. There is a local control of schools through the board of education, the official embodiment of the school system. Consequently, the American system presents a plurality of control systems, which according to Meyer and Rowan, creates the likelihood of a very loose system. This is contrary to the Jordanian, Brazilian, and Venezuelan systems, which are national and centralized. They are all controlled by the executive branch of the government through a Minister of Education. However,

they present slight differences among themselves, too. Jordan, for example, follows the patterns of a monarchical government and a long tradition of bureaucratic administration, so the control system over school would appear to be very tight. Brazil has the characteristics of a national-centralized system, very similar to Venezuela.

From each country a non-random sample of elementary and secondary school teachers was selected. They were required to be regular teachers to participate in the study. These are some of the characteristics of the selected sample:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

Total Sample by Country:

US	Brazil	Venezuela	Jordan	Total
132	109	126	183	550

Partition of the Sample:

(1) By Sex

M	94	32	49	92	267
F	38	77	77	91	283

(2) By Years Experience Teaching in Present Position

1-3	58	51	42	116	267
4-6	31	39	44	41	155
7+	53	19	40	26	138

(3) By Years Teaching

1-3	36	35	30	14
4-6	24	42	32	13
7+	72	32	64	156

	US	Brazil	Venezuela	Jordan
(4) By School Level				
Ele.	60	50	56	78
JHS	29	15	34	51
SHS	43	44	36	54

2. The Questionnaire. The original version of the questionnaire, used in this research, was developed by Blumberg (1980) and tested with a sample of 87 American teachers. This version, which consisted of 43 items, was reduced, first, to 39 items to suit the purposes of the cross-national study, for some items gather information which was only suitable for the American schools. The latter version was translated into Spanish, Portuguese, and Arabic. In the translation process, some other slight modifications were made to compensate for problems of language structure, and the culture of the school settings. Due to the latter reason, the final scale consisted of 34 items common to the four countries. Cooperation relative to the translation and administration of the questionnaire was achieved through current and former studens at the School of Education, Syracuse University.

The structure of the questionnaire items was that of a 6 point Likert-type scale, the extreme of which were ABSOLUTE FREEDOM to ABSOLUTE RESTRICTION relative to teachers' autonomy in the face of a principal's request. Lower scores mean more autonomy, and higher less autonomy.

The reliability of the Teacher Autonomy Scale was tested in two manners. First, following the procedure developed by Cronbach (1972) which consisted of estimating the alpha for the total scale. This is a measure of internal consistency. For the US data, the alpha was of .94, indicating a high level of internal reliability.

Second, a test-retest correlation study was conducted to estimate reliability over time. The correlation was of .80, using a sample of 12 teachers.

Structurally, the questionnaire is composed of three major types of questions that simulate job-oriented requests that a principal might make of a teacher. They are associated with teacher activities related to instructional matters, e.g. preparing teaching material, organizing teacher activities, teaching style, etc.; with activities related to the school as a whole and its maintenance, e.g. keeping student records up to date, being more accurate with attendance reports, etc.; and miscellaneous activities, e.g. take a more active part in faculty meetings. The type one question conveys activities that are part of teacher territory; type two, principal territory; and type three, ambiguous territory.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed for similarities and differences betweeen countries. It was considered appropriate to use analysis of variance, t-test, and Duncan's test. The .05 level of significance was used as the lower limit to make the decision whether to accept or reject the values of F, t, and Duncan's.

Cluster analysis techniques were also employed to evaluate the grouping of variables. For the purpose of the cross-national comparison, it was in the interest of this study to see if variables shift from one domain to another, increasing and decreasing the hypothesized zones of autonomy. That is to say, that teachers under certain circumstances may expand their zone of influence by taking more activities under their control, while decreasing the zone of influence of the principal.

Results

A mean total score for the 34 items common to every country was computed, and an ANOVA, using a General Linear Model (GLM), was employed to test for the difference between countries (Table I).

TABLE I

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON
THE TOTAL AUTONOMY MEAN SCORES BY COUNTRY

Countries	$\bar{X}$	N	
USA	3.31	132	MS = 13.33
Venezuela	2.68	126	F = 2.96*
Jordan	3.13	181	R^2 = 0.11
Brazil	2.64	109	

* $p < .05$

The results of this analysis demonstrated that there exist over all mean differences between countries. Venezuelan and Brazilian teachers perceived themselves enjoying higher autonomy than American and Jordanian teachers.

The analysis of the data concerned the overall sense of autonomy showed that teachers felt from very wide to moderately free to comply or reject the principals' requests.

If the three zones of autonomy found in the United States were applied to the other three countries, the results (Table II) indicated that similar patterns of autonomy existed. These patterns were that in each country teachers felt more autonomous

relative to classroom activities, and less autonomous relative to organizational activities. When comparisons were made within the entire sample, significant differences developed on the three scales: classroom, organization, and miscellaneous.

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEANS OF AUTONOMY
BY COUNTRY ACCORDING TO ZONES OF INFLUENCE

Zones of Influence	Countries				Total	F
	USA	Venezuela	Jordan	Brazil		
Classroom	3.02	2.43	2.99	2.49	2.77	18.59**
Organization	4.02	2.86	3.47	2.80	3.33	47.86**
Miscellaneous	2.88	2.75	2.94	2.65	2.81	3.24*

** $p < 0.001$
* $p < 0.05$

Regarding the three scales, a Duncan's multiple range test showed that Jordanian and American teachers, as a group, are different from Venezuelan and Brazilian teachers ($(p \leqslant 0.05)$) (see Appendix A). American and Jordanian teachers, with very similar mean scores, seemed to feel more restricted than those from Venezuela and Brazil.

Given the nature of autonomy, however, we suspected that more than mean score difference existed between the four countries. Mainly that higher levels of autonomy bring more areas under the teacher sphere of influence. That is, if the three hypothesized areas of influence found in the United States, i.e. classroom, organization, and miscellaneous; may not directly apply to the other countries; the Questionnaire items may shift, increasing and decreasing different areas of influence.

TABLE III

CLUSTER ASSIGNMENT OF 34 AUTONOMY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FOR EACH COUNTRY

Items	Countries			
	USA	Venezuela	Brazil	Jordan
Maintain more order in your classroom	3	1	1	2
Pay more attention to way you grade your papers	3	1	2	2
Be more accurate with your attendance report	3	1	1	2
Engage in personal counseling with your pupils	3	1	1	1
Supervise the playground	2	2	1	1
Keep your lesson plans up to date	3	1	2	2
Change the way you write your lesson plan	1	1	2	1
Take a more active part in faculty meetings	1	2	3	2
Chair a school committee	1	2	3	2
Attend an in-service training program	2	1	3	2
Engage in self-evaluation program	3	1	1	3
Change the way you discipline your students	3	1	1	3

Items	USA	Venezuela	Brazil	Jordan
Prepare more teaching material	1	1	1	3
Change the way you prepare your teaching material	1	1	1	1
Keep student records more up to date	3	1	3	2
Hold parent conferences on school time	2	2	2	1
Hold parent conferences after school time	1	2	1	2
Make home visits after school time	1	2	2	1
Change your teaching style	1	1	2	1
Take your class on a field trip	2	2	3	2
Stay after school for a meeting	2	3	3	3
Keep your class-room neater	1	1	1	2
Meet with the principal and a parent	2	3	1	2
Accept new students in your class	2	3	1	2
Change your curriculum emphasis	1	1	1	3
Change kind of tests you give	1	1	2	1
Change way you organize your teaching activities	1	1	2	1
Use more audio-visual aids	1	1	1	3

Item	USA	Venezuela	Brazil	Jordan
Chair a faculty social committee	1	2	3	3
Accept handicapped students in your class	2	2	1	3
Be observed in your classroom on monthly basis	2	2	1	3
Lecture more in your class	1	1	2	1
Praise your students more	1	1	1	2
Engage in self-improvement program	1	1	1	3

The method chosen for this analysis was to conduct multiple variable cluster analysis within each country and compare the resulting cluster score matrices.[3]

Variable Cluster Analysis is a procedure related to factor analysis in which variables are placed into groups (in this study, three groups were used) which attempts to divide the set of variables into non-overlapping clusters, in such as way that each cluster can be interpreted as essentially uni-dimensional. This clustering procedure attempts to maximize the variance accounted for by the first principal component of each cluster. Variables then are assigned to clusters based on the highest squared correlation with the rotated component of the cluster. Thus, in the resulting scoring matrix, each item is clearly assigned to only one cluster of variables.

---

[3]It should be noted though that this study is exploratory in nature and that the limitation on the sample size prevented us from doing cross-validation studies as is desired when applying multivariate procedures.

Other factor analytic techniques could be used and were tried on an exploratory basis. The variable cluster procedure produced similar results. The clear assignment of variables to a cluster made for a simpler and more parsimonious manner with which to deal with the variation of autonomy between countries.

Tables III and IV present results of the variable cluster analysis. They show a great lack of similarities for the clusters developed within each country. The numbers in the tables refer to zones of influence (1 = classroom ,2 = organization, 3 = neutral).

Table IV summarizes the cluster overlap of Jordan, Venezuela and Brazil with the cluster established for the United States. While in a few instances, a large proportion of items were shared, the basic patterns seem to present different cluster patterns within each of the countries. The teacher sphere of influence is largest in Venezuela that also has the highest autonomy score, and smallest in Jordan that has one of the lowest autonomy mean scores. While the number of items in clusters is similar for U.S. and Brazil, the content differs greatly. (See Appendix B for explanation of cluster content).

TABLE IV

CLUSTER OVERLAP

Number of Items in Cluster and
Comparison Between the US and the Other Countries

		Venezuela			
		1	2	3	
U.S. Clusters	1	12	5	0	17
	2	1	5	3	9
	3	8	0	0	8
		21	10	3	

		Brazil Clusters			
		1	2	3	
US Clusters	1	8	6	3	17
	2	5	1	3	9
	3	5	2	1	8
		18	9	7	

		Jordan Clusters			
		1	2	3	
US Clusters	1	8	4	5	17
	2	2	4	3	9
	3	1	5	2	8
		11	13	10	

It was found that cluster patterns (factor patterns) changed dramatically between countries, with no clear structure underlying most countries. We take this to mean that teacher autonomy varies between countries not only in scme sense of amount, but also in the way teachers see their control over parts of their professional lives. More autonomy brings more of a say in more matters.

It is interesting to note also that not many significant differences, within countries, related to some selected teacher demographic variables developed (Table V). T-test results demonstrated that there was significant differences ($p < .05$) between male and female teachers in Venezuela, Jordan, and Brazil, but not in the United States. Male teachers had higher levels of autonomy than female, and significant difference ($t = 3.81$, $p < .05$) was found between teachers, related to their principal's sex, in Venezuela, but not in the other countries. Teachers in that country felt more autonomy with female principals than male.

The results of the analysis of variance showed that, relative to both time as teacher and time in present teaching position, there were significant differences ($F = 8.97$ and $F = 6.02$ $p < .05$) among Brazilian teachers only. The less time in both situatiors the higher the level of autonomy. And finally, a significant difference ($F = 5.58$ $p < .05$) relative to the school level developed among the Venezuelan teachers only.

Overall, it could be said that mean response differences due to the selected demographic variables is not greatly significant. For the American teachers, none of these variables were important as source of variation of teacher's sense of autonomy. For the Jordanian teachers, only one variable was found to be important, for the Brazilians two, and for the Venezuelan teachers three.

TABLE V

Results of T-Test and Analysis of Variance Relative Demographic Variables Within Countries

	USA		Venezuela		Jordan		Brazil	
Sex:	n	x	n	x	n	x	n	x
Male	38	3.3	48	2.33	92	2.97	32	2.46
Female	94	3.31	77	2.78	89	3.17	77	2.96
	t = 1.43		t = 2.88*		t = 2.10*		t = 2.45*	
Principal's Sex:								
Male	109	3.28	74	2.35	80	3.06	25	2.85
Female	21	3.03	49	2.98	98	3.12	82	2.52
	t = 1.42		t = 3.81*		t = 1.20		t = 1.49	
* $p < .05$								
Years Teaching:								
1-3	36	3.42	26	2.68	12	3.06	35	2.28
4-6	23	3.16	32	2.73	13	3.06	42	2.57
7+	72	3.19	64	2.51	156	3.08	31	3.06
	F = 1.34		F = .68		F = .08		F = 8.97*	

	USA		Venezuela		Brazil		Jordan	
	n	x	n	x	n	x	n	x
Years in Present Position:								
1-3	58	3.28	42	2.60	116	3.07	51	2.37
4-6	31	3.34	44	2.77	41	2.99	39	2.74
7+	40	3.12	37	2.35	23	3.17	18	3.04
	F = .87		F = 2.09		F = .62		F = 6.02*	
Level:								
Ele.	54	3.34	56	2.87	76	3.11	49	2.52
Jr.	29	3.35	24	2.33	51	3.08	15	2.25
High	43	3.10	36	2.30	54	3.01	44	2.84
	F = 1.38		F - 5.38*		F = .42		F = 3.78	

*p < .05

Discussion and Conclusions

It seems to be clear that the total mean score computed for each country involved in this study suggested that teachers felt a fairly moderate to high degree of freedom to comply or reject principal's requests. Applying the three hypothesized zones of autonomy found in the United States, the results of this study showed that teachers felt more autonomy around issues related to the classroom, moderate autonomy regarding neutral issues, and least autonomy relative to organizational matters, as we expected.

The findings appear to be strongly supportive of the idea that teaching everywhere is an activity which enjoys a fair amount of autonomy. It should not be surprising, for teaching, almost everywhere, is performed under similar structural conditions: the formal structure of most schools leads teachers to work in isolation in self-contained classrooms. So, they are allowed to have "a broad discretionary jurisdiction within the boundaries of the classroom."

This study does not support the contention (Meyer and Rowan, 1978) that countries

with pluralistic systems of control, i.e. the United States, will tend to develop a higher degree of looseness and thus a higher degree of autonomy among teachers nor that countries with monolithic systems of control will tend to be more tight and teachers would feel more restricted. Our findings indicated, however, that teachers in the United States felt less autonomous than teachers of other countries. One possible explanation for these results is that the bureaucratic system of control in the US is more developed than in the other countries. Another possible explanation is that due to the decentralization of the educational system, principals feel more of a responsibility as a part of their role to control and influence the work of the teacher. Or at least they may try to present that image.

In the case of the other three countries, with national and centralized systems of education, in which teachers' sense of autonomy appeared to be higher, in comparison with the American teachers, the sources of power and control are very much distant from the school settings, and it may be that principals have not real power to control and influence the work of teachers. A study of the Venezuelan principal, for instance, led Albornoz (1975) to conclude that school principals have not decisionary or innovative power over their schools. We suspect this to be true also in Brazil. Jordan appeared to be more like the United States. That is perhaps due to its monarchy and bureaucratic model of management.

The data suggested that even when the teachers enjoy a large amount of autonomy, and more so relative to the classroom activities, the content of the autonomy changed dramatically between countries. That is to say that teacher autonomy varies between countries not only in the sense of the level that they perceive, but also in the way they see their power to control parts of their professional lives. More autonomy means, in this case, that more activities are put under their control increasing their

field of influence in the school. They have more of a say over more aspects of the school life. The Venezuelan and Brazilian teachers who also enjoy the largest amount of autonomy bring more school activities under their domains. One conclusion of this study is that the variables which define the content of the clusters (zones of autonomy) shifted from one group to another as we move from country to country. This might mean that autonomy is a different thing for different people in different countries.

Except for sex, no significant differences related to demographic variables developed within most of the countries in this study. The fact that sex was an important source of variation in countries like Venezuela, Jordan, and Brazil, favoring male teachers over female, might mean that women in these societies still maintain their sense of submission to the authority figure. In general, however, the findings lead us to conclude that, perhaps, individual characteristics have little to do with perception of autonomy, and that the reasons may be found in the internal characteristics of the school organization, and of the work that teachers perform.

APPENDIX A

Results of the Duncan's Test

General Linear Models Procedure

Duncan's multiple range test for variable class mean classroom area items:

(means with the same letter are not significantly different)

Alpha Level = .05 DF = 544 MS = 0.723481

Grouping	Mean	N	Country
A	3.032468	132	(1) USA
A	2.999816	181	(3) Jordan
B	2.499781	109	(4) Brazil
B	2.439337	126	(2) Venezuela

Variable Organizations:

Alpha Level = .05 DF = 544 MS = 0.873694

Grouping	Mean	N	Country
A	4.029576	132	(1) USA
B	3.473603	181	(3) Jordan
C	2.863435	126	(2) Venezuela
C	2.808122	109	(4) Brazil

Variable Neutral:

Alpha Level = .05 DF = 544 MS = 0.816687

Grouping	Mean	N	Country
A	2.941857	181	(3) Jordan
A	2.881710	132	(1) USA
B	2.704743	126	(2) Venezuela
B	2.651398	109	(4) Brazil

APPENDIX B

Cluster Content By Country

United States

(1) Change in lesson plans
Active in faculty meetings
Chair committee
Prepare more teaching materials
Change teaching materials
Parent conferences after school
Home visitations after school
Change teaching style
Keep classroom neater
Change curriculum
Change tests
Change organization of teaching activities
Use more audio-visual
Chair social committee
Lecture more in class
Praise students more
Engage in self-improvement program

(2) Supervise playground
Attend in-service
Parent conferences on school time
Take class field trips
Meetings after school
Meet with principal and parent
Accept new student
Accept handicapped student
Observed monthly

(3) Maintain order
Attention to grading papers
Attendance reports
Counsel pupils
Lesson plans up to date
Engage in self-evaluation
Change discipline
Students records up to date

Brazil

(1) Maintain order
Attendance reports
Counsel pupils
Supervise playground
Engage in self-evaluation
Change discipline
Prepare more teaching materials
Change teaching materials
Parent conferences after school
Keep classroom neater
Meet with principal and parent
Accept new student
Change curriculum
Use more audio-visual
Accept handicapped student
Observed monthly
Praise students more
Engage in self-improvement program

(2) Attention to grading papers
Lesson plans up to date
Change lesson plans
Parent conference on school time
Home visitation after school
Change teaching style
Change tests
Change organization teaching activities
Lecture more in class

(3) Active in faculty meetings
Chair committee
Attend in-service
Students records up to date
Take class field trips
Meetings after school
Chair social committee

Jordan

(1) Counsel pupils
Supervise playground
Change lesson plans
Active in faculty meetings
Change teaching materials
Parent conference after school
Home visitation after school
Change teaching style
Change tests
Change organization teaching activities
Lecture more in class

(2) Maintain order
Attention to grading papers
Attendance reports
Lesson plans up to date
Chair committee
Attend in-service
Student records up to date
Parent conference on school time
Take class field trips
Keep classroom neater
Meet with principal and parent
Accept new student
Praise students more

(3) Engage in self-evaluation
Change discipline
Prepare more teaching materials
Meetings after school
Change curriculum
Use more audio-visual
Chair social committee
Accept handicapped student
Observed monthly
Engage in self-improvement program

Venezuela

(1) Maintain order
Attention to grading papers
Attendance reports
Counsel pupils
Lesson plans up to date
Change lesson plans
Attend in-service
Engage in self-evaluation
Change discipline
Prepare more teaching materials
Change teaching materials
Student records up to date
Change teaching style
Keep classroom neater
Change curriculum
Change tests
Change organization teaching activities
Use more audio-visual
Praise students more
Engage in self-improvement program

(2) Supervise playground
Active in faculty meetings
Chair committee
Parent conference after school
Parent conference on school time
Home visitation after school
Take class field trips
Chair social committee
Accept handicapped student
Observed monthly

(3) Meetings after school
Meet with principal and parent
Accept new student

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albornoz, Orlando. Poder y Liderazgo en la Escuela Primaria Venezolana. Caracas, Venezuela: Publicaciones del Instituto Societas, 1977.

Bidwell, Charles. The School as a Formal Organization, in James March (ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1965.

Blumberg, Arthur. Administrative Requests and Teacher Autonomy. Unpublished Manuscript. Syracuse University, 1980.

Charter, W.W., Jr. Sense of Teacher Work Autonomy: Measurement and Findings. Eugene Oregon: University of Oregon. Center for Educational Policy and Management, ND.

Cohen, Michael D., James G. March and Johan P. Olsen. A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17: 1-21 (1972).

Coombs, P.H. The World Educational Crisis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Cronbach, Lee, et al. The Dependability of Behavioral Measurement. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1972.

Durkeim, Emile. Educational and Sociology. New York: The Free Press, 1956.

Katz, Daniel and Robert L. Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organizations. Second Edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.

Kunz, Daniel and Wayne K. Hoy. Leadership Style of Principals and the Professional Zones of Acceptance of Teachers. Educational Administrative Quarterly, 12: 49-64 (1976).

Lortie, Dan C. School Teacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

_____. The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School, in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), The Semiprofessions and their Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Menlo, Allen. A Comparison of School Related Preceptions, Attitudes, and Values of Teachers in Three Countries. Paper presented at the AERA, Toronto, Canada, 1978.

Meyer, John and Brian Rowan. The Structure of Educational Organizations, in Marshall Meyer (ed.) Environments and Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Parsons, Talcott. Social Structure and Personality (Chapter Six). New York: Free-Press, 1970.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Fred D. Carver. The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. Second edition. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1980.

Sousa, David A. and Wayne K. Hoy. Bureaucratic Structure in Schools: A Refinement and Synthesis in Measurement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17: 21-39 (1981)

Tannenbaum, Arnold, et al. Hierarchy in Organizations: An International Comparison. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Weick, Karl E. Educational Organizations as Loosely-Coupled Systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21: 1-29 (1976).